

2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: Office of Research Infrastructure Programs Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 12:20:11 PM

1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

2. Fiscal Year

2018

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Office of Research Infrastructure Programs Special
Emphasis Panel

3b. GSA Committee No.

875

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

09/29/1995

6. Expected Renewal Date

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?

No

8b. Specific Termination Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear

Continue

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority

Authorized by Law

12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16)

13. Effective Date

11/20/1985

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee

Special Emphasis Panel

16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this
FiscalYear

17a. Open 0 17b. Closed 1 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 1 Meetings and Dates

Purpose

NIH Peer Review

Start

04/03/2018

End

- 04/03/2018

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 1

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$20,374.00	\$20,762.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00

18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$21,774.00	\$22,162.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.10	0.10

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts.... This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research and technical authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical applications (and/or contract proposals) that focus on infrastructure support for clinical research centers, research centers for minority institutions, and primate centers and comparative medicine. The committee reviewed 2 grants requesting \$92,999.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

This committee has a fluid membership with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. The reviewers for each meeting are selected to evaluate grant applications or contract proposals for a specific, perhaps narrow, expertise area. Participants for each meeting are assembled to most efficiently and effectively cover the number and breadth of applications or contracts requiring review. The members of this committee are authorities knowledgeable in the various disciplines and fields related to biomedical and behavioral research and from areas related to administrative, scientific, and infrastructural technical expertise.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

This Special Emphasis Panel held one meeting during this reporting period.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and behavioral research and from areas related to administrative, scientific, and infrastructural technical expertise who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized complex nature of the applications and proposals requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

The meeting was closed to the public for the review of grant applications and/or contract proposals. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

21. Remarks

Reports: This committee did not produce any public reports during the fiscal year. URL: The committee does not maintain a website.

Designated Federal Officer

Ross Shonat Chief

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
BETTS, MICHAEL	04/03/2018	04/03/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BIGA, PEGGY	04/03/2018	04/03/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
FORD, ELIZABETH	04/03/2018	04/03/2018	SENIOR DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KIER, ANN	04/03/2018	04/03/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MANKOWSKI, JOSEPH	04/03/2018	04/03/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
OBARA, TOMOKO	04/03/2018	04/03/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
VOSS, STEPHEN	04/03/2018	04/03/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 7

Narrative Description

The goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability, from the rarest genetic disorder to the common cold. The NIH mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone. NIH works toward that mission by supporting the research of non-Federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions throughout the country and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS Act states that "The Secretary...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of (A) applications; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts..."

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

Improvements to health or safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>

Increased customer satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Under \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$100,000 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Over \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost Savings Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

1,271

Number of Recommendations Comments

This committee reviewed for applications for support of scientific conferences.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations

are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments

Minutes, written and oral reports

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

An action of “approved” or “recommended” for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH’s funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant’s management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated <u>Number</u> of grants reviewed for approval	2
What is the estimated <u>Number</u> of grants recommended for approval	2
What is the estimated <u>Dollar Value</u> of grants recommended for approval	\$92,999

Grant Review Comments

NA

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Committee Web Site	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online GSA FACA Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Publications	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Access Comments

Contact IC Committee Management Officer, Ms. Sharon Sealey, at 301-435-1142.